

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/244,984

Applicant(s)

BLACK ET AL.

Examiner

Marjorie A. Moran

Art Unit

1631

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marjorie A. Moran.

(3)_____.

(2) Brian McCaslin.

(4)_____.

Date of Interview: 03 March 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: BLACK et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Marjorie A. Moran
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner stated that the after-final amendment filed 2/3/03 would not be entered as the change in dependency of claims 41 and 42 creates new issues (limitations) requiring new consideration. The examiner further stated that while the proposed amendment of claims 63 and 66 would overcome the new matter rejections, the removal of limitations with regard to particular domains (S1 and S1S3) may result in reinstatement of double patenting and prior art rejections. The examiner also suggested that the attorney consult the Trilateral Agreement (Vienna, Austria Nov. 4-8, 2002) for guidance in formulating future claim language.